IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:	09/940,974	**Conf. No.:**	6358
Appellant:	Dickerson, JR.	**TC/AU:**	3623
Filed:	08/28/2001	**Examiner**:	Loftis, Johnna Ronee
		Docket:	END920010076US1

Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR GENERATING A VALUE PROPOSITION FOR A COMPANY IN AN INDUSTRY

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

This is an appeal from the Final Office Action dated August 20, 2007 rejecting claims 23 and 26-33. This Brief is accompanied by the requisite fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.17 (c).

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

International Business Machines Corporation is the real party in interest.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

As filed, this case included claims 1-22. Claims 23-33 were previously added. 1-22, 24

and 25 have been cancelled. Claims 23 and 26-33 remain pending, stand rejected, and form the basis of this appeal.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A Final Office Action was issued by the Office, dated August 20, 2007, in response to an Amendment that was filed on May 29, 2007 by Appellant. In response to the Final Office Action, a Notice of Appeal was submitted on October 22, 2007. No After-Final Amendment has been filed.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The present invention provides computerized methods for identifying a solution to address exposed performance gaps and for generating a value proposition of a company in a specific industry; a computer system for generating a value proposition of a company in a specific industry; and, program products for generating a value proposition of a company in a specific industry.

Claim 23 claims a computerized method (item 100 at Fig. 3; ¶[0053]) for identifying a solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) to address exposed performance gaps (¶[0031]) of a company (item 34) in a specific industry (item 28), comprising: first identifying a plurality of operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28), wherein the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) includes a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company (item 32) in the specific industry (item 28), wherein the specific industry (item 28) is a grocery store industry (¶[0034]), wherein the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) include at least one

of a rate of inventory turnover and a number of customers per day (¶¶[0034],[0036]); assembling a set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) for application by the specific industry (item 28), wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service; assessing impacts of application of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) on the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28), wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a negative impact on an operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) and determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a positive impact on the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]); after identifying, assembling, and assessing, then comparing a current operational performance (¶[0029]) of the company (item 34) to an operational performance (¶[0029]) of another company (item 32) within the specific industry (item 28) to obtain at least one performance gap (¶[0031]), wherein the operational performance (¶[0029]) includes a performance of a company (item 32) based upon the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28); identifying a solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) based upon the impacts to address the exposed performance gaps (¶[0031]), wherein the solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and outputting (¶[0040]) the solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) from the computer system (item 10 at Figure 1; see in general ¶¶[0039]-[0048]).

Claim 29 claims a computerized method (item 100 at Fig. 3; ¶[0053]) for generating a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) for a company (item 34) in a specific industry (item 28) in a computer system (item 10 at Figure 1; see in general ¶¶[0039]-[0048]), comprising the steps of: first identifying a plurality of operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28), wherein the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) include a factor used to measure

health or viability of a generic company (item 32) in the specific industry (item 28), wherein the specific industry (item 28) is a grocery store industry (¶[0034]); assembling a set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) for application by the specific industry (item 28), wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service; assessing impacts of application of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) on the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28), wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a negative impact on an operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) and determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a positive impact on the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]); after identifying, assembling, and assessing, then comparing a current operational performance (¶[0029]) of the company (item 34) to an average operational performance (item 44, ¶[0029]) of companies (item 32) within the specific industry (item 28) to expose at least one performance gap (¶[0031]), wherein the current operational performance (¶[0029]) of the company (item 34) includes a performance of the company (item 34) based upon the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28); generating a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) by identifying a solution based upon the gaps (¶[0031]) and the impacts, wherein the solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and outputting (¶[0040]) the value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) from the computer system (item 10 at Figure 1; see in general ¶¶[0039]-[0048]).

Claim 30 claims a computerized method (item 100 at Fig. 3; ¶[0053]) for generating a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) for a company (item 34) in a specific industry (item 28) in a computer system (item 10 at Figure 1; see in general ¶¶[0039]-[0048]), comprising the steps of:

first identifying operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28), wherein the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) includes a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company (item 32) in the specific industry (item 28), wherein the specific industry (item 28) is a grocery store industry (¶[0034]); assembling a set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) for application by the industry (item 28), wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service; assessing impacts of application of the solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) on the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28), wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a negative impact on an operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) and determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a positive impact on the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]); after identifying, assembling, and assessing, then comparing a current operational performance (¶[0029]) of the company (item 34) to an average operational performance (¶[0029]) of companies (item 32) within the specific industry (item 28) to expose performance gaps (¶[0031]), wherein the current operational performance (¶[0029]) includes a performance of a company (item 34) based upon the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28); generating a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) by identifying a solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) based upon the gaps (¶[0031]) and the impacts that improves a business value of the company (item 34), wherein the solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and outputting (¶[0040]) the value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) from the computer system (item 10 at Figure 1; see in general ¶¶[0039]-[0048]).

Claim 31 claims a computer system (item 10 at Figure 1; see in general ¶¶[0039]-[0048])

for generating a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) for a company (item 34) in a specific

industry (item 28), comprising: an information system (item 50 at Fig. 2; ¶¶[0050]-[0052]) for

receiving operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]), a set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) for

application by the specific industry (item 28), operational performance data (item 42) of the

company (item 34), and average operational performance data (item 44) of companies (item 32)

within the specific industry (item 28), wherein the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028])

include a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company (item 32) in the specific

industry (item 28), wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service,

wherein the specific industry (item 28) is a grocery store industry (¶[0034]); an assessment

system (item 52 at Fig. 2; ¶¶[0050]-[0052]) for assessing impacts of application of the solutions

(item 38; ¶[0032]) on the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item

28), wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032])

has a negative impact on an operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) and determining which of the

set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a positive impact on the operational metric (item 36;

¶[0028]); a comparison system (item 54 at Fig. 2; ¶¶[0050]-[0052]) for comparing, after the

assessing, an operational performance (¶[0029]) of the company (item 34) to an average

operational performance (¶[0029]) of the companies (item 32) within the specific industry (item

28) to expose performance gaps (¶[0031]), wherein the operational performance (¶[0029]) of the

company (item 34) includes a performance of the company (item 34) based upon the operational

metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28); a generation system (item 56 at Fig.

2; ¶¶[0050]-[0052]) in the computer system for generating a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030])

by identifying a solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) based upon the impacts to address the exposed

performance gaps (¶[0031]), wherein the solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and an outputting system (¶[0040]) for outputting the value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]).

Claim 32 claims a program product stored on a recordable medium (¶[0048]) for generating a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) for a company (item 34) in a specific industry (item 28), which when executed, comprises: program code configured to receive operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) and a set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) for application by the industry (item 28), wherein the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) include a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company (item 32) in the specific industry (item 28), wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service, wherein the specific industry (item 28) is a grocery store industry (¶[0034]); program code configured to assess impacts of application of each solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) on the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the industry (item 28), wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a negative impact on an operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) and determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a positive impact on the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]); program code configured to, after assessing, compare a current operational performance (¶[0029]) of the company (item 34) to an operational performance (¶[0029]) of another company (item 32) within the industry (item 28) to expose performance gaps (¶[0031]), wherein the current operational performance (¶[0029]) of the company (item 34) includes a performance of the company (item 34) based upon the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28); program code configured to generate a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) from a computer system (item 10 at Figure 1) by

identifying a solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) based upon the gaps (¶[0031]) and the impacts, wherein the solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and program code configured to output (¶[0040]) the value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]).

Claim 33 claims a program product stored on a recordable medium (¶[0048]) for generating a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) for a company (item 34) in a specific industry (item 28), which when executed, comprises: program code configured to receive operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]), a set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) for application by the industry (item 28), operational performance data (item 42) of the company, and average operational performance data (item 44) of companies (item 32) within the industry (item 28), wherein the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) include a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company (item 32) in the specific industry (item 28), wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service, wherein the specific industry (item 28) is a grocery store industry (¶[0034]); program code configured to determine impacts of application of the solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) on the operational metrics (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the industry (item 28), wherein the determining includes determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a negative impact on an operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) and determining which of the set of solutions (item 38; ¶[0032]) has a positive impact on the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]); program code configured to, after determining, compare an operational performance (¶[0029]) of the company (item 34) to an average operational performance (¶[0029]) of the companies (item 32) within the industry (item 28) to expose performance gaps (¶[0031]), wherein the operational performance (¶[0029]) of the company (item 34) includes a

performance of the company (item 34) based upon the operational metric (item 36; ¶[0028]) for the specific industry (item 28); program code configured to generate a value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]) from a computer system (item 10 at Figure 1) by identifying a solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) based upon the impacts to address the exposed performance gaps (¶[0031]), wherein the solution (item 38; ¶[0032]) is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and program code configured to output (¶[0040]) the value proposition (item 46; ¶[0030]).

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Whether claims 23 and 26-33 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

2. Whether claims 23 and 26-33 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 101, for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

3. Whether claims 23 and 26-33 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Machin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,877,034), hereinafter "Machin", in view of Sanders (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,936), hereinafter "Sanders".

ARGUMENT

1. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 23 AND 26-33 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 23-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office asserts that, "[t]here is nothing in the specification that clearly sets forth steps one would take to enable them to assess the

impact of **all** possible solutions." (emphasis added) Final Office Action, page 4, item 8.

Appellant respectfully contends that one of ordinary skill in the art of, for example, business management would be enabled to practice the claimed invention, based on the specification along with his/her business management knowledge, at the time of the invention. Appellant contends that the foundation of the Office's rejection rests, in large part, on its fallacious contention that because there are an "endless" number of possible metrics and solutions and that the specification does not disclose steps to enable one to assess impact on "all possible solutions." Final Office Action, item 8, page 4. Appellant respectfully contends that the Office, in making its rejection, is creating a threshold of proof that is not required by statute, but is also erroneous because it is logically unobtainable. Simply put, to write a hypothetical specification that would address all possible solutions to practice a feature recited in a claim, would be infinite in length. It is logical that the specification must merely provide enough information so that one of ordinary skill is able to practice the claimed invention. The Appellant has met its statutory burden.

To this extent, Appellant respectfully submits that the claims are clearly enabled in the specification. Accordingly, Appellant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office alleges, "it is not clear what the conflict resolution rules are and it is not clear how they are implemented in such a way to determine a solution." Final Office Action, page 4, item 8.

Appellant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that the specification clearly meets the enablement requirement. Specifically, one of ordinary skill in the art of, for example,

business management would be enabled to practice the claimed invention. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would able to obtain and/or know the conflict resolution rules for the particular industry (e.g., the grocery store industry) readily. Appellant cites, for example, paragraphs [0035], [0041], and [0051] in the specification for adequate disclosure and enablement on how to implement the conflict resolution rules. As claims 23 and 26 indicate, the conflict resolution rules aid in assessing impacts of applying a set of solutions on the operational metrics for an industry when, for example, a solution has a positive impact on one metric but a negative impact on another metric.

To this extent, Appellant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is clearly enabled via the specification and/or with the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art of business management at the time of the invention. Accordingly, Appellant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

2. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 23 AND 26-33 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 101

The Office has rejected claims 23-33 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office asserts that the claimed invention does not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In making its rejection, the Office makes several statements that the Appellant will attempt to address herein.

The Office asserts that the claims lack concreteness because "the claims, in a sense, directed to brainstorming to come up with potential solutions to potential problems." (sic) Final Office Action, page 5, item 9. Appellant respectfully respond that the claims are not directly or indirectly directed to brainstorming; the claim language speaks for itself. The Office further asserts that, "[t]here is no objective methodology explaining how to identify solutions to

problems that don't necessarily exist." Final Office Action, page 5, item 9. Applicants point to, for example, paragraphs [0032], [0035], and [0036] which address the methodology of the identification of solutions of "recognized problems" (see e.g., ¶¶[0032], [0035]). The claims do not include addressing problems that do not exist. Thus, the Appellant is unable to further address the aforementioned statement in its entirety. Finally, the Appellant further asserts that the conflict resolution rules are not "repeatable" and, therefore, the claims cannot enable one "to select a solution that has positive impact on one metric but a negative impact on another solution." (sic) Final Office Action, item 9, page 5. Applicants point to, for example, dependent claim 26 which clearly enables one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention, including features similar to the arguments posed above.

In any event, Appellant respectfully contends that the claims clearly are concrete because the claims all include, *inter alia*, outputting solutions from the computer system. This is a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Accordingly, Appellant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

3. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 23 AND 26-33 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) OVER MACHIN IN VIEW OF SANDERS

Regarding independent claim 23, Appellant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection because neither Machin nor Sanders, nor the combination, teach, or suggest, each and every feature in claim 23, (see also independent claims 29-33). Further, the invention claimed invention is not obvious in view of Machin and Sanders. Interpreting Machin and Sanders only for the purposes of this brief, Appellant submits that, to the contrary, Machin does not teach or suggest any type of method that includes, *inter alia*, "**first** identifying a plurality of operational metrics for the specific industry, [ ], wherein the specific industry is a grocery store industry, wherein the operational metrics include at least one of a rate of inventory turnover and a number

of customers per day" (emphasis added), as in claim 23 of the present invention. To the contrary, Machin merely discloses a benchmarking technique for use with a Customer Relationship Management (CRM) call center. Further, Sanders does not remedy this glaring deficiency in Machin.

In supporting its rejection of claim 23, the Office admits that the combination of Machin and Sanders does not teach a grocery story industry. Final Office Action, page 7, item 10. The Office then contends that the feature is merely an intended use, and, as such, much result in a structural difference. In reply, the Appellant contends that the claimed features create a structural difference over the prior art. For example, there is a structural difference vis a vis the claimed features of, "assembling a set of solutions for application by the specific industry"; "assessing impacts of application of the set of solutions on the operational metrics for the specific industry", wherein the specific industry is the grocery store industry. Clearly, *inter alia*, there are no operational metrics that are identified for a grocery store industry that includes a rate of inventory turnover in Machin and Sanders. Further, it appears that the Office is alleging that the call turnover in the cited art is the teaching of rate of inventory turnover in a grocery store. Final Office Action, page 7, item 10. Appellant strenuously traverses the rejection. There are structural differences between the claimed invention and the call center in the cited art.

Accordingly, Appellant submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in either Machin or Sanders of a method that first identifies a plurality of operational metrics for the specific industry, wherein the specific industry is a grocery store industry, and wherein the operational metrics include at least one of a rate of inventory turnover and a number of customers per day, as disclosed in claim 23. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of

claim 23.

  With respect to independent claims 29-33 and dependent claims 26-28 Appellant contends that for the same reasons stated above, that these claims too are allowable and, accordingly, requests withdrawal of the rejections thereto.

  Accordingly, Appellant contends that claims 23 and 26-33 are in condition for allowance and that the rejection should be withdrawn. Accordingly, for these reasons, Appellant submits that the present invention is not anticipated by Machin and Sanders, individually or in combination, and that the application is in condition for allowance. With respect to features in the dependent claims not specifically referenced herein, the dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Appellant submits that claims 23 and 26-33 are allowable because the claimed invention complies with all enablement requirements; is clearly directed to statutory subject matter; and, is not anticipated by the cited references, Machin and Sanders, either alone or in combination.

Respectfully submitted,

/   Joseph J. Christian   /

Joseph J. Christian
Reg. No. 51,560

Date: December 21, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044

JJC/lrc

CLAIMS APPENDIX

23. A computerized method for identifying a solution to address exposed performance gaps of a company in a specific industry, comprising:

first identifying a plurality of operational metrics for the specific industry, wherein the operational metrics includes a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company in the specific industry, wherein the specific industry is a grocery store industry, wherein the operational metrics include at least one of a rate of inventory turnover and a number of customers per day;

assembling a set of solutions for application by the specific industry, wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service;

assessing impacts of application of the set of solutions on the operational metrics for the specific industry, wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions has a negative impact on an operational metric and determining which of the set of solutions has a positive impact on the operational metric;

after identifying, assembling, and assessing, then comparing a current operational performance of the company to an operational performance of another company within the specific industry to obtain at least one performance gap, wherein the operational performance includes a performance of a company based upon the operational metric for the specific industry;

identifying a solution based upon the impacts to address the exposed performance gaps, wherein the solution is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and

outputting the solution from the computer system.

26. The method of claim 23, wherein the determining further comprises:

applying a set of conflict resolution rules when a solution has a positive impact on a first operational metric and a negative impact on a second operational metric; and

then determining from the applying whether the solution should be identified for implementation.

27. The method of claim 23, wherein identifying the plurality of operational metrics, assembling, assessing, comparing, identifying the solution, and outputting steps are repeated automatically at a scheduled interval.

28. The method of claim 23, wherein the another company is a best in class company in the specific industry.

29. A computerized method for generating a value proposition for a company in a specific industry in a computer system, comprising the steps of:

first identifying a plurality of operational metrics for the specific industry, wherein the operational metrics include a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company in the specific industry, wherein the specific industry is a grocery store industry;

assembling a set of solutions for application by the specific industry, wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service;

assessing impacts of application of the set of solutions on the operational metrics for the specific industry, wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions has a

negative impact on an operational metric and determining which of the set of solutions has a positive impact on the operational metric;

after identifying, assembling, and assessing, then comparing a current operational performance of the company to an average operational performance of companies within the specific industry to expose at least one performance gap, wherein the current operational performance of the company includes a performance of the company based upon the operational metric for the specific industry;

generating a value proposition by identifying a solution based upon the gaps and the impacts, wherein the solution is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and

outputting the value proposition from the computer system.

30. A computerized method for generating a value proposition for a company in a specific industry in a computer system, comprising the steps of:

first identifying operational metrics for the specific industry, wherein the operational metrics includes a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company in the specific industry, wherein the specific industry is a grocery store industry;

assembling a set of solutions for application by the industry, wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service;

assessing impacts of application of the solutions on the operational metrics for the specific industry, wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions has a negative impact on an operational metric and determining which of the set of solutions has a

positive impact on the operational metric;

after identifying, assembling, and assessing, then comparing a current operational performance of the company to an average operational performance of companies within the specific industry to expose performance gaps, wherein the current operational performance includes a performance of a company based upon the operational metric for the specific industry;

generating a value proposition by identifying a solution based upon the gaps and the impacts that improves a business value of the company, wherein the solution is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and

outputting the value proposition from the computer system.

31. A computer system for generating a value proposition for a company in a specific industry, comprising:

an information system for receiving operational metrics, a set of solutions for application by the specific industry, operational performance data of the company, and average operational performance data of companies within the specific industry, wherein the operational metrics include a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company in the specific industry, wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service, wherein the specific industry is a grocery store industry;

an assessment system for assessing impacts of application of the solutions on the operational metrics for the specific industry, wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions has a negative impact on an operational metric and determining which of the set of solutions has a positive impact on the operational metric;

a comparison system for comparing, after the assessing, an operational performance of the company to an average operational performance of the companies within the specific industry to expose performance gaps, wherein the operational performance of the company includes a performance of the company based upon the operational metric for the specific industry;

a generation system in the computer system for generating a value proposition by identifying a solution based upon the impacts to address the exposed performance gaps, wherein the solution is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and

an outputting system for outputting the value proposition.

32. A program product stored on a recordable medium for generating a value proposition for a company in a specific industry, which when executed, comprises:

program code configured to receive operational metrics and a set of solutions for application by the industry, wherein the operational metrics include a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company in the specific industry, wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service, wherein the specific industry is a grocery store industry;

program code configured to assess impacts of application of each solution on the operational metrics for the industry, wherein the assessing includes determining which of the set of solutions has a negative impact on an operational metric and determining which of the set of solutions has a positive impact on the operational metric;

program code configured to, after assessing, compare a current operational performance of the company to an operational performance of another company within the industry to expose performance gaps, wherein the current operational performance of the company includes a performance of the company based upon the operational metric for the specific industry;

program code configured to generate a value proposition from a computer system by identifying a solution based upon the gaps and the impacts, wherein the solution is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and

program code configured to output the value proposition.

33. A program product stored on a recordable medium for generating a value proposition for a company in a specific industry, which when executed, comprises:

program code configured to receive operational metrics, a set of solutions for application by the industry, operational performance data of the company, and average operational performance data of companies within the industry, wherein the operational metrics include a factor used to measure health or viability of a generic company in the specific industry, wherein the set includes one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service, wherein the specific industry is a grocery store industry;

program code configured to determine impacts of application of the solutions on the operational metrics for the industry, wherein the determining includes determining which of the set of solutions has a negative impact on an operational metric and determining which of the set of solutions has a positive impact on the operational metric;

program code configured to, after determining, compare an operational performance of

the company to an average operational performance of the companies within the industry to expose performance gaps, wherein the operational performance of the company includes a performance of the company based upon the operational metric for the specific industry;

program code configured to generate a value proposition from a computer system by identifying a solution based upon the impacts to address the exposed performance gaps, wherein the solution is at least one of a decision, an action, a product, and a service that impacts a problem in a positive manner; and

program code configured to output the value proposition.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence has been submitted.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings.